DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 039 831 HE 001 522

AUTHOR	Wilson, Herbert A.
TITLE	The Cooperative College Development Program. Progress Report.
INSTITUTION	Phelps-Stokes Fund, New York, N.Y.
PUB DATE	Dec 69
NOTE	16p.
EDRS PRICE	EDRS Price MF-$0.25 HC-$0.90
DESCRIPTORS	Administrative Personnel, *Administrator Role, Coordination, Financial Needs, *Financial Support, *Higher Education, Interinstitutional Cooperation, *Negro Colleges, *Training
IDENTIFIERS	*Cooperative College Development Program

ABSTRACT

The Phelps-Stokes Fund and Title III of the Higher Education Act have jointly supported the Cooperative College Development Program (CCDP) in which 70 institutions were participating by the end of 1969. One of the major purposes of the program is to train college administrators and trustees in the art of effective fund raising. More generally, CCDP has concentrated on the development concept and its implications for management and teamwork. This report presents: a brief analysis of the difficulties of institutionalizing this development concept; and a summary of program activities which included (1) training sessions for presidents, trustees and development officers, (2) field follow-up by CCDP staff, (3) a training session for new institutions to give them a "head start" in anticipation of membership in CCDP, (4) an attempt to analyze the success of CCDP efforts systematically, and (5) efforts to develop a more accurate composite profile of the entire CCDP membership. It also describes the establishment of a Development Laboratory, equipped to demonstrate how filing, mailing, and duplicating equipment can be used for development functions, and to illustrate the efficiency of a coordinated system. Information on CCDP's personnel and on grants received by some of the participating institutions is also included. (AF)

ED039831

THE COOPERATIVE COLLEGE DEVELOPMENT PROGRAM

PROGRESS REPORT

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION & WELFARE
OFFICE OF EDUCATION
THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL OFFICE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY

HE001 532

By:
Herbert A. Wilson
Vice President
Phelps-Stokes Fund

December, 1969

INSTITUTIONALIZING AN IDEA

Summary Analysis

When an institution claims important ideas, knowledge, or procedures that are retained only in the minds of individuals, such valued possessions have a dubious existence or at best a fleeting presence. Obviously, people come and go, and what they know or possess personally is likely to go with them. The same thing holds true of development officers and what they learned from CCDP, or of a president who has had some success as a one man fund raiser. But to achieve continuity and long-range success, any such personal knowledge must be given institutional perspective related to the broad field of experience, converted into a system of procedures, and built into institutional management.

Early in its program, CCDP concentrated on the development concept and its implications for management and teamwork. The concept is a tremendous idea, but getting it institutionalized has been a failing task for most development officers and a major cause of concern by CCDP and its consulting staff. A simple example is the fact that centralized gift processing is not only difficult to achieve on some campuses but has strong opposition in places of power.

It is relatively easy to rationalize this situation: schools need more time to get ready for an idea that is vastly different from anything previously experienced; or institutional resources simply are not available to implement the idea. But the fact is that two specific concerns have literally permeated every effort exerted by newly enlightened development officers and/or CCDP staff and consultants:

1. *The apparent need to achieve breakthroughs with many presidents who either never understood the development concept or did not accept it in their various schemes for institutional advancement; and*

2. *The need to educate other major administrative officers who sit closer to the center of power on their respective campuses, or who have developed their own power bases.*

To be sure, it takes time to train a development officer, the most important part of such training being experienced on the job. If experiences on campus are limited or circumscribed, there is limited growth. And although the development concept can be defined simply as <u>the management approach to institutional support</u>, a significant barrier to its acceptance is the "management team" itself. Perhaps this is the point where education could best begin, maybe even with management individuals as a basis for forming a team.

Nevertheless, CCDP continues to be a very important investment in education, an unending challenge to its staff, and a story of periodic institutional successes

which literally reversed reality. Unmistakably, no gigantic fund-raising goals were achieved. Moreover, some indices of achievement without proper perspective would appear very unimpressive. For example, a few schools blur what might have been a fair picture of alumni support with less than one percent participation. Howevever, with few exceptions most of the schools began development activities from zero, and any progress is note-worthy. And in historical perspective, a few schools did what was described for them previously as impossible. For example, one school with no history of alumni fund-raising was able to get graduates in the home community to produce $165,000 in a short time, largely through a mail campaign. The more salient point is that in no circumstances where failure or very limited success has been experienced have we seen systematic, tenacious effort. We hold out for the best results when the best effort has been exerted.

Before the year ended, seventy (70) schools constituted CCDP; 26 were added to our Title III Consortium as of July, 1969 -- a net gain of 25. The total membership is distributed as follows, according to control and CCDP sponsorship:

Auspices:

Sloan Foundation - Phelps-Stokes - - - - - - - - - - - 30
(present program scheduled for termination January, 1970)

Title III, Higher Education Act of 1965 - - - - - - - 40

By Control:

Public Institutions - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - -33

Private Institutions - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - 37

Program activities this year have included: 1) continued training sessions for presidents, trustees and development officers; 2) field follow-up by CCDP staff; 3) a training session with new institutions to give them a "head start" in anticipation of membership in CCDP through increased funding of our Title III Consortium; 4) an attempt to analyze the success of CCDP effort more systematically; and 5) efforts to develop a more accurate composite profile of the entire CCDP membership.

More specifically:

- *There were seven training sessions, including one for a new group of institutions which formed the basis for the addition of 26 schools in preparation for their anticipated participation in the Program.*

- *CCDP staff members visited all of the 45 members during the year at least twice, plus two day visits to the additional 26 schools referred to above.*

- *A direct mail program was established to provide interim communications and materials to member institutions periodically. CCDP also expanded greatly its mailing list of friends of the Program*

and of the Phelps-Stokes Fund to receive special information.

- *A nucleus of consultants have been secured to meet special needs of schools through one and two day visits.*

- *A training laboratory is completed and in use at the Moton Conference Center, Capahosic, Virginia.*

- *An unusual Profile gives an indication of success in fund-raising and the ambitious goals many schools aspire to achieve.*

Institutions continue to present problems in overall management -- little evidence of planning, coordination, team work and the need for adequate development manpower (volunteers and staff). These are the things which hamper, periodically, any significant attempts by development officers to advance the Institution through its supporting arm. These also are some of the factors which caused CCDP to schedule cluster conferences to small groupings of institutions, to take the development perspective to other institutional administrators and some trustees.

The program continues to be an exciting challenge for the CCDP staff and promises yet to produce a self-perpetuating development entity on most of the campuses involved. The report is presented in detail according to areas of activity and progress reported in this summary -- all of which were aimed at institutionalizing the development idea.

ANNUAL PROGRESS REPORT

Training Sessions

Training sessions were again of three kinds -- the Institute, Seminar, Conference. Institutes, typically one week in duration, were for development officers. Seminars were held for presidents for three and one-half (3½) days within the same week as the Development Institute, and with arrangements for several joint sessions. Conferences for two and one-half (2½) days were conducted for trustees from each institution -- also within the same week of sessions for their respective presidents and development officers, and with special arrangements for joint meetings.

Sessions for development officers, presidents and trustees were held last spring at the Moton Conference Center with trustees being housed in Williamsburg, Virginia. Subject matter for these programs included the following categories: Capital Gifts Programs, The Development Program, Corporate and Foundation Sources, Staffing Trustee and Volunteer Committees, Constituency Records and Equipment, and The Big Gift. Trustees and presidents gave particular attention to improving Boards of Trustees and Institutional Planning. In the fall, two duplicate sessions were held for Development Officers. Subject matter concentrated heavily on Organization and Promotion of Deferred Giving, Current and Deferred Methods

of Giving, Relating to Power Structures, and Future of the Development Office.

It is of interesting note that some presidents seem to derive development perspective for the first time after they became involved, following their own insistence, in some of the "nuts and bolts" of development management. Deferred giving discussions and activities appeared to claim greater attention on the part of development officers than any other single body of subject matter. It can only be conjectured that deferred giving offers more in the way of specific plans and less in theory and broad principles.

Training sessions, dates and attendance are listed as follows:

April 21 - 23	23 Presidents		
April 28 - May 2	8 Presidents	11 Trustees	13 D.O's
May 12 - 16	8 Presidents	16 Trustees	16 D.O's
June 9 - 13	7 Presidents	15 Trustees	15 D.O's
Sept. 28 - Oct. 1	--	--	18 D.O's
Oct. 1 - 4	--	--	26 D.O's
Oct. 20 - 24	--	--	28 D.O's

Development Laboratory

A development laboratory was completed during the year at the Moton Conference Center, Capahosic, Virginia, and was used during Spring and Fall Training sessions that included Development Officers, Presidents and Trustees (Spring only). The laboratory is maintained in the new meeting facility which was completed in early 1969.

Equipped with filing, mailing and duplicating equipment, and with constituency research tools, the laboratory is designed to:

1. Give an indication of the ease with which all major development functions can be housed together in a relatively small amount of space;

2. Demonstrate how hardware and systems can be utilized to serve development functions;

3. Demonstrate through role playing how effectively and efficiently a coordinated system can work.

To date, more than seventy (70) institutions have had representatives to observe and utilize the laboratory, and, with multiple representation from several institutions, a total of more than one hundred (100) individuals have profited from the addition of this facility.

Specifically, the laboratory is equipped with the following items:

1. *Acme Visible Records, Electrofile, 7 tray unit;*

2. *Addressograph, with friction feed and lister, including electronic qualifier;*

3. *Addressograph Graphotype and auxiliary cabinets;*

4. *Frident Flexowriter and selectadata selective reader;*

5. *Pitney-Bowes automatic folding and inserting machine, postage meter, mailing scale, and rack and table;*

6. *Vu-Lyte III (projector) 115 volt AC complete with feed-o-matic and pointex (tempered glass);*

7. *Xerox Copier.*

Associated with the rationale for the laboratory and with support from the Ford Foundation, a total of 380,000 record cards -- including six different types for major constituent groups -- were distributed to 33 institutions to enable them to begin good record systems immediately. On order are an additional 278,550 cards for 15 institutions. The cards were designed cooperatively by CCDP and the professional counsel retained by the Program.

Direct Mail Program

In establishing CCDP's first direct-mail effort, interim communications and memorandum were sent according to plan to all Development Officers -- between campus visits and as a follow-up to training sessions at Capahosic, Virginia.

Some of the materials sent included: (1) FOR YOUR INFORMATION MEMO #1 which included a Select Bibliography of useful readings (14 in number), covering several aspects of Higher Education; (2) FOR YOUR INFORMATION MEMO #2, including an article on How to Select Counsel. The CCDP Report was also sent to all institutional participants.

CCDP also expanded greatly its mailing list of friends to the Program and of the Phelps-Stokes Fund, and mailed them the CCDP Report and other special information pieces when they were deemed appropriate.

The response from the mailing of the annual report resulted in an article being published in a publication of The Southern Association of Colleges and Schools, The CLEARING-HOUSE, Bulletin No. 4, March, 1969.

New Service and Co-Director

A new Co-Director for governmental relations was appointed on September 1, 1969, and was assigned to Washington, D. C., where he will serve simultaneously as Director of the College Service Bureau -- an office of the United Negro College Fund. The new Co-Director will be functioning essentially as follows:

1. Cataloging and maintaining a current file of information regarding available support for the wide range of college and university activities.

2. Assisting CCDP institutions in securing difficult appointments related to highly significant institutional proposals.

3. *Providing a service for institutional officials who may need to revise proposals and resubmit them while in Washington. This service includes stenographic and duplicating assistance.*

4. *Cultivating key influences in the various agencies so as to be fully informed about possibilities which are not always spelled out clearly in the various guidelines and literature that describe a wide range of program opportunities.*

In addition to utilizing periodically the data assembled in CCDP headquarters regarding each institution, the Co-Director for governmental relations will visit campuses of member institutions to learn first hand something about the scope of each institution's program, and to reinforce his understanding of these as they were viewed earlier in institutional literature.

Headquarters for the new Co-Director are maintained at 1026 Seventeenth Street, N.W., Washington, D. C.

Institutional Visits and an Emerging Profile

In addition to regular follow-up requirements at each institution, the CCDP staff made observations on campuses that will facilitate the development of an unusual development profile for all institutions. Questions were raised regarding plans for capital campaigns, the amount of endowment, if any, that would be sought, the proportion of capital needs designated for physical plant, and the documented case for projected needs. Efforts were also made to determine how these needs could best be evaluated in terms of existing endowment, plant value, and present status of annual income from gifts and grants.

Preliminary data suggest several things:

1. Ambitious fund-raising goals have been set - at least tentatively - and there is little evidence that they are based on potential as well as need.

2. Physical needs (buildings) significantly dominate the total capital needs package. When private schools are taken separately, the picture changes somewhat.

3. The value of physical plants tend to be exceptionally high compared to non-CCDP counterparts.

4. Percentage of income from gifts and grants range from 9.0 to 43.9.

5. Libraries on the average have holdings far less than 200,000 volumes, Atlanta University being the exception with a cooperative library reporting 245,000+ volumes.

6. Alumni annual giving ranges from 0.0 to 50.0 percent participation, with most schools showing less than 10.0 percent; the average gift ranged from $2.00 at one institution to $133.00 at another which also had the highest percentage of participation.

It is concluded from these data that CCDP is headed in the right direction with its efforts to build a composite profile but perhaps should separate public and private schools for comparative purposes in each category. Such a profile should be most helpful to the CCDP staff as it counsels with development personnel who are now planning systematic fund-raising efforts and, more especially, case statements which must be persuasive and compelling. Perhaps the profile can also become a new tool for use with gift prospects.

Two development officers assisted in visiting the 26 new institutions, evaluating and surveying their needs for training and performing follow-up counselling assistance.

The professional growth observed in these men has caused the Staff to implement a program of inter-institutional visits which will give new development officers a chance to observe and assess programs at at least three institutions according to predetermined criteria.

Staff Changes

CCDP has a good professional staff that is versatile although small; three were secured during the year and one was upgraded from semi-professional standing. The staff is as follows:

James L. Snyder	-	Campaigns
Robert E. Griffin	-	Annual Fund - Alumni
Blanche A. Case	-	Records & Research, Information
G. L. Washington	-	Government Relations
Garvey E. Clarke	-	Part-time Consultant (Corporate Giving)
Edgar M. Gemmell	-	Part-time Consultant (General)

Nuggets of Achievement

In addition to nuggets of achievement reported in the Progress Report of April, 1969, the following items are noteworthy:

> Meharry Medical College received an anonymous gift of $1,000,000 to endow a scholarship program and a chair in internal medicine. Significant additions were also made to the Meharry Board of Trustees.
>
> Lincoln University has received a benefaction of $50,000 from The Charles E. Merrill Trust, to be applied to the second phase of the University's $15,000,000 Leadership Fund.

Tuskegee Institute received a $350,000 Ford Foundation grant for its department of architecture to provide student assistantships, additional faculty, library acquisitions, video tape system, and a summer program for advanced students.

South Carolina State College received a grant of $207,000 from the W. K. Kellogg Foundation to strengthen the College's Department of Social Sciences.

Bishop College has prepared and presented to the Ford Foundation an excellent report on financial support it received during 1957-58; and 1966-67, and consequently has a very useful development tool.

Florida A. & M. University will benefit immeasurably from the acquisition of a resort center purchased recently by the University's independent foundation. The property will serve as a center for professional retreats, forms of continuation education, for creative endeavors, and for the recreation of its constituent groups.

Conclusion

In conclusion, it appears that CCDP has been effective and that significant progress is being realized on many campuses. The other side of the picture can be best stated with an excerpt from the CCDP Progress Report of April, 1969: "There is mounting evidence, however, to support the need for priority consideration in the area of overall institutional management if most of the schools are to achieve necessary efficiency in the supporting areas which facilitate the educational process and to realize their fullest potential as educational institutions. At the moment, assistance in training, selection, and systems design seem necessary to develop and mobilize effective management teams, such teams being therefore capable of promoting leadership, improved

programs and efficiency in the educational process. The focal point of attention would begin at the top and include second echelon administrators and middle management personnel. It would also be exceedingly helpful if some thought could be given to how CCDP institutions might best be helped to identify and recruit the kinds of trustees who would be able and energetic sponsors of these schools and who are capable of attracting financial resources because of their stature and commitment.

"It might be concluded then that, while the work of CCDP is effective and achieving the results intended, the challenge involves something much more complex than the simple task of fund-raising. Exceptionally qualified and dedicated people, combined with effective systems and procedures, must exist in these times if schools, such as CCDP members, will be able to span the transition required of them by new generations of youth. Our institutions must be able to meet their demand for the kind of education which will prepare them to develop and become part of a new, socially-sensitive society whose advent is in sight and will surely permeate our whole experience as we move into the 21st century."